

REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Official Action dated 23 May 2006 (hereinafter, the “Action”). This paper is submitted as a fully-responsive reply to the Action, and the Applicant requests favorable consideration of this response at the earliest convenience of the Office.

As stated in Paragraph 2 on Page 2 of the Action, claims 1-14 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,329,578 to Brennan, et al. (hereinafter, “Brennan”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,939 to La Porta, et al. (hereinafter, “La Porta”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,157 to Clarke, et al. (hereinafter, “Clarke”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,082 to Cox, et al (hereinafter, “Cox”). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Turning first to **independent claim 1**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 1 to clarify further features of the method. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces here part of the revisions to claim 1:

“enabling the subscriber to request that outgoing communications that relate to special feature codes, and that originate from the calling line identification number, be blocked;”

The Applicant submits that the revisions to claim 1 are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, by the originally-filed specification, at least by page 13, line 2 and page 14, lines 25-29 thereof.

Turning to the cited art, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on Page 3 of the Final Action that neither Brennan, LaPorta, nor Clarke disclose overriding the outgoing

call blocking function for at least a second single outgoing communication from the calling line by entering an override code. Accordingly, the Action cited Cox for this teaching.

Without conceding that Cox provides the teaching for which it is cited, the Applicant respectfully submits that Cox fails to teach or suggest at least the features reproduced above as recited in claim 1. Cox pertains generally to a telephone call management system and method. The Action cited column 3, lines 28-40 and column 7, lines 46-53 of Cox for its discussion related to access codes.

Without conceding that Cox provides the teaching for which it is cited in the Action, the Applicant submits that Cox neither teaches nor suggests “enabling the subscriber to request that outgoing communications that relate to special feature codes, and that originate from the calling line identification number, be blocked”. Instead, Cox appears to address blocking or completing calls depending on whether the call is for official or personal purposes. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Cox neither teaches nor suggests at least the above features from claim 1 that are reproduced above. The Applicant also submits that the other cited § 103 references, Brennan, La Porta, and Clarke, do not provide this teaching or suggestion.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, Clarke, and Cox do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 1, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-10. In addition to the foregoing, however, the Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 to clarify further features of the method. These revisions are fully supported by the same portions

of the specification that were cited above with claim 1. More specifically, claim 2 recites that “the special feature code is a star-feature code,” and claim 3 recites that “the special feature code relates to conference call capabilities.” The Applicant also submits that Brennan, La Porta, Clarke, and Cox neither teach nor suggest the features recited in claims 2 and 3.

Based on the foregoing bases, the Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 2-10.

Turning now to **independent claim 11**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 11 to clarify further features of the method.

For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here a portion of claim 11, with revisions shown in redline:

“enabling the subscriber to prohibit ~~special feature calls~~ that relate to special feature codes from being placed from the calling line, wherein at least one of the special features is a star feature code that relates to conference calling capabilities;”

The revisions made to claim 11 are similar to those features discussed above in connection with claims 1-3, and are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis.

Turning to the cited art as applied in the Action, Paragraph 8 on Page 5 of the Action applied La Porta to “special feature calls”, as recited in claim 11. The Action cited column 6, lines 29-45 of La Porta, which relates to calls directed to 900 number destinations. The Applicant respectfully submits that the 900 numbers referred to by La

Porta neither teach nor suggest “enabling the subscriber to prohibit calls that relate to special feature codes from being placed from the calling line, wherein at least one of the special features is a star feature code that relates to conference calling capabilities”, as recited in claim 11.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, Clarke, and Cox do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 11, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 11.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 11 apply equally to claims 12-14. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 12-14.

Turning now to **independent claim 22**, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 22 to clarify further features of the system. The revisions made to claim 22 are similar to the revisions made to claim 11, but the revisions made to claim 22 pertain more specifically to:

“a services circuit node adapted to enable a subscriber to the outgoing call blocking service to ... prohibit special feature-calls that relate to special feature codes from being placed from the calling line, wherein at least one of the special features is a star feature code that relates to conference calling capabilities;”

The revisions made to claim 22 are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 11 above. More specifically, the services circuit node (SCN) is referenced at 134 in Figure 1.

Turning to the cited art, the comments directed to claim 11 above regarding Brennan, La Porta, Clarke, and Cox apply equally to claim 22. Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, Clarke, and Cox do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 22. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 22.

Claims 23-24 depend from claim 22 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 22 apply equally to claims 23-24. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 23-24.

Conclusion

The Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections favorable action of claims 1-14 and 22-24. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent favorable action on this case, **the Office is requested to contact the undersigned to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257

Date: 23 Aug 06